

I. Introduction

In the Office Action dated Nov. 15, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 13-15, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,442,391 ("Johansson"). Further, claims 6-12, 16-18, and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,138,003 ("Kingdon") in view of Johansson. In this Amendment, claims 1-12 and 19-25 have been amended and claims 13-18 have been cancelled. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejections in light of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

II. Johansson Does Not Anticipate Independent Claims 1, 13, or 20

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 13-15, and 19-21 as being anticipated by Johansson. The currently claimed invention is directed to a method and system for managing communications relating to a location of a wireless communication device between two devices to provide safety and privacy to the wireless device user. Generally, rules of communication are established between two devices. Communication is then managed between the two devices and ***either an identifier or a location*** of the wireless communication device is shown to one of the communicating devices requesting the location of the wireless device if the wireless communications device approves of the device requesting the location information. However if the wireless communications device does not approve of the device requesting the location information, the requesting device is not shown the location of the wireless communications device.

Johansson relates to a system for prohibiting unauthorized users from determining a location of the mobile device. While Johansson discloses a method for protecting ***a location*** of the mobile device, Johansson does not disclose or suggesting protecting ***an identity*** of the wireless communication device in any way as in the currently claimed invention. Thus, Johansson necessarily cannot disclose or suggest ensuring a device only knows ***either an identity or location*** of the wireless communication device, but not both. Independent claims 1, 19, and 20 all recite a limitation to allow a remote source or a location-enabled service to know ***either an***

identity or a location of the wireless communications device. Therefore, Johansson necessarily cannot anticipate independent claims 1, 19, and 20, or any of their dependent claims. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-5 and 19-21.

III. The Proposed Combination of Kingdon and Johansson Does Not Render Independent Claims 1, 22, 23, and 25 Unpatentable

The Examiner rejected claims 6-12, 16-18, and 22-25 as being unpatentable over Kingdon in view of Johansson. Like Johansson, Kingdon does not disclose or suggest allowing a remote source or a location-enabled service to know ***either an identity or a location*** of a wireless communication device as recited in each of the independent claims.

Kingdon is directed to a telecommunications system which performs authorization checks prior to allowing a location service to position a mobile terminal within a cellular network. Like Johansson, Kingdon discloses a system for protecting ***a location*** of the mobile terminal only. Kingdon does not disclose or suggest protecting ***an identity*** of the mobile terminal in any way as in the currently claimed invention. Therefore, due to the fact neither Kingdon or Johansson disclose or suggest ensuring a device knows ***either an identity or a location*** of the wireless communications device, but not both, any combination of Kingdon and Johansson necessarily cannot render the currently claimed invention unpatentable. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to claims 6-12 and 22-25.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested. If there are any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "S W Brim", written over a horizontal line.

Scott W. Brim
Registration No. 51,500
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200